BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08633 051 9

No. 4562.44

GIVEN BY

United Irish League of America

Irish National Movement

and

Leader John E. Redmond

Should Be Sustained

7562.44

Address by John O'Callaghan, National Secretary
United Irish League of America

Grand Opera House, Philadelphia

April 1st, 1906

United Irish League of America.
May 21. 1906

ADDRESS OF JOHN O'CALLAGHAN

National Secretary, United Irish League of America, Grand Opera House, Philadelphia April 1st., 1906

Reprinted From The Irish World

Four thousand men and women of Irish birth or descent, whose hearts are aglow for the cause of Irish nationalism, tendered an enthusiastic reception to John O'Callaghan, of Boston, Sunday evening, April 1, in the Grand Opera House, Philadelphia. The big gathering was under the auspices of the local United Irish League, of which Mr. O'Callaghan is national secretary.

Hon. Michael J. Ryan presided, and toward the close of the exercises announced subscriptions aggregating about $8,000, which have been contributed since the beginning of the year to support the movement of the Irish Parliamentary party to obtain home rule for Ireland. An effort is to be made to raise $2,000 additional within the next four weeks.

Those Who Made Speeches.

Besides an eloquent address by Mr. O'Callaghan, in which he declared his firm faith in the imminent triumph of the Home Rule cause, speeches were made by P. J. Timmins, M. D., president of the Municipal Council of Boston; Rev. Frank J. O'Hare, of Newry, Ireland; the Rev. William A. McLoughlin, rector of St. Stephen's Catholic Church, and the Rev. Cornelius J. Gillespie, S. J., rector of the Church of the Gesu.

Others on the stage were the Rev. H. F. Wilkes, C. M., of the Church of the Immaculate Conception; the Rev. James P. Parker, of South Bethlehem; the Rev. W. S. Singleton, S. J., of the Church of the Gesu; Hugh McCaffrey, John McCaffrey, Daniel Gallagher, Thomas Devlin, Thomas Reilly, John C. Sullivan, Francis P. McCue, Dr. Thomas B. O'Reilly, James F. Lennon, Michael O'Neill, Magistrate O'Brien, Patrick Dunlevy and Charles Bigley.

Michael Donohoe, president of the Central Council of Philadelphia, United Irish League, called the meeting to order and announced that Michael J. Ryan would preside.

Mr. Ryan referred to Mr. O'Callaghan as the best-informed man on the Irish question in America, and as one who had been outstripped by no other in zeal for the cause of Irish nationalism.

Cheers for Mr. O'Callaghan.

Mr. O'Callaghan was received with rousing cheers, and the entire audience rose to greet him. After paying a tribute to John F. Finerty, of Chicago, the national head of the U. I. L. in this country, Mr. O'Callaghan said that when Mr. Finerty decided to retire from the national presidency he trusted it would be the league's good fortune to put in his place a man of the sterling worth of Michael J. Ryan.

The speaker also referred in terms of praise to Archbishop Ryan, who, he said, was an inspiration to the league and to the representatives of Irish rights in this struggle in their own country.

MR. O'CALLAGHAN'S ADDRESS.

Mr. John O'Callaghan said:

Ladies and Gentlemen.—I esteem it a very high honor and privilege to be invited by your presiding officer, our honored and faithful friend, Mr. Ryan, to come to Philadelphia and meet the men and women who have been such a tower of strength to the Irish national cause in times gone by, and never more so than during the past three or four years.

I am in no sense a public speaker, and shall, therefore, have to crave your indulgence during the time I intend to occupy in whatever crude and unpolished remarks I may have to make to you this evening. I could not, however, resist the urgent invitation of your honored chairman to visit your city, and in my humble capacity, as one of the workers in the movement of the United Irish League, thank you for what you have done to sustain and support it.

I think we of the United Irish League of America have been fortunate since its establishment at the call of the Irish people, some five years ago, in having at its head the grand old war-horse of Irish nationality in Chicago, Hon. John F. Finerty, whose whole life has been wrapped up in the Irish movement, and

who has never lowered the flag to any foe of Ireland's freedom whatever. And in coming to Philadelphia to-night to begin an acquaintance which, I trust, we of the United Irish League in New England will extend and make general when the next convention of our organization is held in this city next autumn, I am sure I but express the unanimous sentiment of our organization in New England (and in that I will be borne out by some of our Boston friends on the platform) when I say that when our national president, Mr. Finerty, decides to lay down the duties of his office I hope we may be fortunate enough to secure in his place at the head of the organization a man of the sterling worth, the conspicuous ability, the rugged honesty and the tireless devotion in this cause of your presiding officer of this evening.

We of Boston desire to thank Mr. Ryan and the people of Philadelphia for the magnificent support they have accorded this movement, for we feel that were it not for what Philadelphia has done, especially during the past five years, the leaders of the movement in Ireland would have been seriously crippled in their efforts, and the present glorious prospects of the Irish cause might not have been rendered possible.

Phildelphia's Magnificent Support of the Irish Cause.

I wish, too, on behalf of our organization to avail of this opportunity to thank your venerable Archbishop Ryan of Philadelphia for the magnificent encouragement and splendid leadership he has accorded to us in this cause from the beginning. His example has been an inspiration to the friends of this movement not alone in this country but in Ireland as well.

Now, in coming to Philadelphia to-night, I desire to say that I have not come here for the purpose of personally attacking any man or any organization that declares his or its intention of antagonizing English rule in Ireland, no matter in what form. I think it is unfortunate that at the present or any other crisis in the history of Irish affairs it should not be possible to have Irish sentiment in America absolutely unanimous in support of the movement of the people of Ireland. It is destructive of good results in many ways. Apparent differences of opinion among Irish Nationalists give an excuse for apathy and negligence in supporting the Irish cause to those who are at best but indifferent friends of Ireland, while it prevents the solid massing of American sentiment that is not directly Irish, and which is a most important factor in this struggle absolutely and completely on the side of Ireland, as would be possible if Irishmen themselves were to throw themselves heart and soul into this movement.

Moral Sentiment of the United States in Support of Ireland.

Gladstone, in the closing years of his life, repeatedly declared that no force was more powerful on the side of Ireland in compelling a settlement of the age-long struggle than was the moral sentiment of the outside world, and above all of the United States of America. It is for that reason, therefore, that I would like to devote a brief time this evening to discussing some of the declared causes and apparent reasons given by those who insist on holding aloof from the work of this movement, and who do so, as I believe, mistakenly, in the name of Irish patriotism and nationality.

So strongly do I feel about this feature of the question that I think, at any cost short of absolute surrender of principle, every effort ought to be made to unite Irishmen in America on a common platform in support of the movement in Ireland, and the personal feelings or peccadilloes of any man or any little coterie of men, no matter on which side of this question they may be found, ought not for a moment be allowed to weigh in the balance against the interests of the Irish cause.

Some men in America, happily not a very large body, insist as the sole and self-appointed guardians of the Irish national cause, that the highest duty of Irish Nationalists to-day in America is to thwart, obstruct, misrepresent and denounce the movement of the people of Ireland, and the men whom they have selected to lead it. If these men are right in their attitude, if that is the duty of Irish Nationalists in the United States, then we of the United Irish League must be absolutely wrong in our position, which is, that it is our duty, without inquiring the why or the wherefore, to stand behind the men whom Ireland selects to speak for her, to lend what assistance we may in helping them to carry on the unequal struggle in which they are engaged in Ireland and at Westminster, and to create and foster to the utmost extent of our power a feeling of sympathy for Ireland in America, and of antagonism to English influence until Ireland's rights have been conceded.

Two Diametrically Opposite Lines of Policy.

There are here two diametrically opposite lines of policy, and only one of them can be the correct and patriotic one. Which it is I shall endeavor to demonstrate before I get through.

I come here, too, for another reason in my judgment scarcely less important. I come, although neither in Philadelphia nor elsewhere in America, nor indeed for that matter anywhere throughout the world, is it necessary to do so, to defend from outrageous and insulting attack and misrepresentation an Irishman, who in my judgment will leave as deep an impress on the history of his time as any Irishman who has lived for a century, and who, if he is properly supported by his race abroad, as he is being supported and sustained at home, is, I believe, destined to win for Ireland in his lifetime the right of Irish national self-government.

I speak of the courageous, cool, calm, fearless, determined, able and well-tried Nationalist, John E. Redmond, the leader of the Irish Parliamentary Party and of the Irish race. A glorious heritage of nationalist ancestry, a public career of twenty-five years in the full blaze of publicity before the world, and reforms wrung from a hostile Parliament in Westminster, which a few years ago seemed impossible, ought to be sufficient to save John Redmond from the foul attacks of men whose services to Irish nationality have not been sufficient to make them worthy to loose the latchet of his shoes, but who, exercising the privilege of the cur who barks at the mastiff, secure a little passing notoriety by snarling at the heels of the man selected by the Irish people to lead them in this movement.

I trust before I get through to drag the last shred of covering from the nakedness of the arguments—if they can be dignified by such a name—of the men who have made it their stock in trade to attack Mr. Redmond ever since he was selected as the chosen leader of the Irish people.

What Brand of Irish Patriotism is This?

First and foremost I ask what brand of Irish nationality is it, what type of Irish patriotism is it moulded on, what is the inspiring sentiment which dictates that while Mr. Redmond, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Davitt, the Irish Parliamentary party, and the United Irish League of Ireland are singled out for attack, for denunciation, for misrepresentation, and for the employment against them of falsehood, yet permits the open and avowed enemies of Ireland's national cause, the Chamberlains, the Balfours, the Salisburys, the Longs and the rest of the anti-Irish tribe, to remain immune, without a voice raised, or a pen employed by these same self-styled Irish Nationalists against them?

I ask you to look at the speeches and writings of these men for five years back, and while in every issue of their organ John Redmond and the Irish party have been assailed, where can you point to a single sentence of opposition to or denunciation of the Englishmen who have been withholding self-government from Ireland? They were even patted on the back when they were arresting and imprisoning the representatives of Ireland only two or three years ago, as if it was the work of patriotism to send Irishmen to prison for defending their own people. This attitude, on the part of certain men who claim to be leaders among the Irish people of America, is sought to be justified mainly on two grounds. First, that the present Irish movement is not a national one, and, secondly, that its leader, Mr. John Redmond, is not as advanced a Nationalist as Parnell was, and is not as extreme in his views concerning Ireland's national demand.

I shall show that both declarations are untrue. I shall, in addition, deal with one or two other points which have been made portion of the stock in trade of the men who have attacked Mr. Redmond, and demonstrate that their contention is untenable, and that their claims constitute no proper or substantial reason why the movement led by John Redmond should be antagonized by any man calling himself an honest Irish Nationalist in America.

Utter Falsehood of the Charges Made against Redmond.

One point of these I have dealt with nearly a year ago and shown the utter falsehood of the charges made against Mr. Redmond concerning it in letters to the Irish World; that is the sale of his property to his tenants in Wexford two years ago. Another point I shall also touch on to-night, and that is the claim which has recently been made by Judge O'Neil Ryan, of St. Louis, in a speech in New York City a month ago, in which he claimed for the Clan-Na-Gael of America the sole and absolute credit for the defeat of the arbitration treaty with England a year ago.

Before I leave this platform to-night I shall prove that both declarations are

false; that Mr. Redmond, so far from being unfair to his tenants, made sacrifices for them which they duly appreclated, and that so far from the Clan-Na-Gael of the United States being the sole factor in antagonizing the British treaty and causing its defeat, its leaders simply trailed along behind the United Irish League in whatever they did on the question.

Now I propose in dealing with these matters to mention two or three names only, and in order that the old, time-worn artifice of asserting that mentioning their names is "felon setting" may be anticipated, I wish to say that I simply do so because in recent issues of their organ, The Gaelic American, they have been put forward, or put themselves forward, as the spokesmen of the element which is hostile to the work of the United Irish League and of the Irish Parliamentary party. I mean Mr. John Devoy, who spoke in Brooklyn a month ago, and whose speech was reported in his own paper, and Judge O'Neil Ryan, of St. Louis, who took up the hue and cry the following Sunday in New York.

I do not wish to belittle the dignity of Judge O'Neil Ryan beyond saying this, that if he were a judge of the Supreme Court of the United States, instead of a judge from Missouri, I would not remain silent when he unjustly attacks the honored leader of the Irish movement, John Redmond.

O'Neil Ryan then Extolled the Men and the Policy He now attacks.

I met Mr. O'Neil Ryan in Ireland some twelve or fourteen years ago when he went over there on what he termed a "peace mission." He was then engaged in the laudable effort of endeavoring to heal the break which had occurred in the Irish party's ranks, and in doing so he was by no means measured in his language in extolling the abilities, the patriotism and the national principles of John Redmond, whom he now attacks. He did it in my hearing in the hotels in Dublin; he did it in the lobby of the House of Commons in London, which he was as anxious as any Irishman I have ever seen to explore, if not admire.

Perhaps to some extent his present position in regard to the movement of the people of Ireland may be accounted for by the fact that his first reception there was, unfortunately, a somewhat inhospitable one. I am very sorry to say that he and his fellow passengers were shipwrecked just before reaching Queenstown, and I believe he had to undergo the rather undignified experience, for a judge (as he has since become) of being taken ashore in a cradle, or some such conveyance. At all events, I trust I shall not be accused of "treason to Ireland" if I select these two men as the sponsors or the spokesmen of the opposition in America to the Irish Parliamentary party.

Mr. Devoy reiterated in his Brooklyn speech what he has been perpetually dinning into the ears of his followers through the editorial columns of his paper for five years back, that the hostility of the Clan-Na-Gael of America to the Irish party and Mr. John Redmond is because he declared that "The separation of Ireland from England is impossible, and if possible, undesirable."

There are one or two points in connection with this topic which I think are worthy of your attention. The first is that the speech in which Mr. Redmond is alleged to have made this statement was made before the Cambridge Union of Cambridge University in England on February 26, 1895. The second is that Mr. Redmond has repeatedly declared that he never made such a statement in that speech. The third is that no verbatim report of the speech is in evidence or ever was printed. And the fourth is that the abstract of about a column and a half of a more than two-hour speech, which was printed in the newspapers, was the work of an English reporter who understood little, and cared less probably, about the question.

Mr. Redmond's Repeated Declarations concerning Ireland's Distinct Right to Rule Herself.

You will notice as significant that for five years back the words and statements of Englishmen, no matter what their declarations were, have been accepted by these same critics of the Irish movement in preference to the public statements and the life-long career of struggle for Ireland of the men whom they attack. Mr. Redmond's repeated declarations in every quarter of the world for twenty-five years in favor of Ireland's distinct right to rule herself, apart from England's interference should of itself be sufficient answer to the assertion made against him.

But to go further. In the very abstract from this speech for which he is criticized, sent out by the English press association, the lie is given to the charge. In that speech Mr. Redmond is reported to have said, dealing with what Home Rule meant that "while the two countries, England and Ireland, were

side by side, closely connected, geographically and socially, they were distinct nations. What Home Rule meant was this—between separation from England, on the one side, and the over-centralization of government on the other, Home Rule meant the middle course, the division of executive and parliamentary labors. It meant that an Irish assembly should be charged with the duty of managing purely Irish local affairs, and that the Imperial Parliament should be left to manage all properly so-called Imperial affairs.

"The Irish," he added, "did not ask England for the concession of Home Rule for Ireland as a boon or privilege. They asked it as a right. The Irish had their Parliament 500 years ago. They had never surrendered it. The whole government of Ireland by the English had been one long record of coercion, disaffection and misery, and failure was written on every page of it."

These extracts of themselves indicate the tenor of the speech which Mr. Redmond made on the occasion, even as it was given to the world by an English reporter, even if Mr. Redmond had not declared to newspaper men, as he has done more than once, and in my own hearing in Boston on November 8, 1901, that the suggestion that he had made it had been so frequently answered that it was unnecessary to deal with it further.

Why is it that John Devoy, in 1896, 1897, 1898, and 1899 (when Mr. Redmond visited America) professed Sympathy with the Policy which He now Antagonises?

But there is another phase of this question. If, as he is now charged by Mr. Devoy and Judge O'Neil Ryan and the other spokesmen of his hostile critics in America, as having done in his speech at Cambridge—"betrayed the Irish national cause"—then I want to know why it was that in 1896, in 1897, in 1898 and in 1899 on each occasion that Mr. Redmond visited America, Mr. John Devoy (as he did to my own personal knowledge) sought the back stairs of the Hoffman House in New York to run around after John Redmond, to express his sympathy with and encouragement of him in his position in Irish political affairs, and conveyed as far as lay in his power to his followers in America that he was a sympathizer with and a supporter of Mr. Redmond's political position.

You, Mr. Chairman, are a lawyer, and you know what "condonation" means, to put it on no higher ground. If Mr. Devoy was willing to fraternize with Mr. Redmond in 1896 and 1897 and 1898 and 1899, then he must not have been deeply impressed by Mr. Redmond's "betrayal" of the Irish cause in 1895, or else his professions of friendship were hypocritical.

But let us see what Mr. Redmond's opinions were around that date. On St. Patrick's Day, 1892, in the city of Dublin, Mr. Redmond, after defining Ireland's national demand, declared: "This is our ultimatum; this is our irreducable minimum on this question. The Irish Parliament must be supreme from interference in the control and management of the affairs of Ireland so long as an Irish Parliament exists." That was shortly before the introduction of Gladstone's second Home Rule bill when Mr. Redmond again insisted that an Irish Parliament should be supreme in regard to Irish affairs, and that no veto by the English crown on the advice of the English Parliament would be tolerated on Irish measures.

What Constitutes a Nation?

Let us see what he said in another address in Boston, in my own hearing, and in the presence of most of the prominent members of the Clan-Na-Gael in Boston. Speaking to the toast "Ireland a Nation," in the Parker House, Boston, on December 8, 1896, Mr. Redmond asked: "What constitutes a nation? Not prosperity, not success, nor even freedom. Why is Ireland a nation? She is a nation from her geographical position, the character, the genius of her people, and her history.

"The long effort of the last 700 years by England to absorb into herself and make Ireland a part of England has been a failure. When the Almighty traced the lines of the universe He gave to Ireland a separate existence. Ireland can never be part of England. No matter what the future history of the country may be, Ireland is a separate country, and a separate country it always will remain. Her people are a people with a distinct character and genius of their own.

"The character and genius of the Irish people is entirely distinct from that of the Saxon, or the English people. The Irish are far more distinct in character and genius than any people on the continent of Europe. By her character and genius, by her geographical position, Ireland is, and always has been, a separate and distinct nation.

"The history of Ireland has been a sad one, but it has been all through that of a nation whom bribes or intimidation could not induce to give up the spirit of liberty. So long as you find a country separated geographically, in character, the genius of the people, and preserving in the most remarkable degree her demand for liberty, that country is entitled—no matter what her position may be at the present moment—she is entitled to be called a nation."

When Mr. Redmond made that declaration in the presence of the followers of Mr. Devoy in Boston, Mr. Devoy did not then, nor for years after, express any doubt of the sincerity and sterling character of John Redmond, the Nationalist. It is rather late in the day for him now to attempt to go back and ask other people to execute a right about face because he, chameleon-like, has seen fit to change his views. What did Mr. Redmond say on this very point in the hearing of a good many men in this hall to-night, at the convention of the Uni ed

Irish League of America in New York, on August 31, 1904? Let me read his words:

"My views are moderate views," said Mr. Redmond. "But if IT WERE IN MY POWER TO-MORROW BY ANY HONORABLE MEANS TO ABSOLUTELY EMANCIPATE IRELAND I WOULD DO IT. I would feel it my duty to do it. (Great applause.) I believe it would be just as possible for Ireland to have a prosperous and free separate existence as a nation as Holland, or Belgium, or Switzerland, or other small nationalities. (Applause.) And if it were in the power of any man to bring that result about to-morrow by honorable and brave means, he would be indeed a coward and a traitor to the traditions of his race did he not do so. (Applause.)

"But that is no reason why men should not, with whatever means are at their disposal, do what they can to advance the cause of Ireland. I am here to say," he added, "that under existing circumstances it is my profound conviction—under existing circumstances—that there is only one way, one practical way, in which you can advance the cause of Ireland, and that is along the lines on which we are travelling."

"To Hell with no Honest Irishman."

Those words of Mr. Redmond express the views of the members of the United Irish League, both in Ireland and in America, and it is, therefore, vain for Mr. John Devoy or Judge O'Neil Ryan to endeavor to put them in a false position before the public of the United States. And in the next few words at that convention, Mr. Redmond answered completely and absolutely the falsehoods which have been charged against him of having attacked the Clan-Na-Gael at any period. For you will remember that when some man in the hall, incensed at the attitude of Mr. Redmond's critics, made an uncomplimentary remark about the Clan-Na-Gael, he answered: "No. 'To hell' with no honest Irishman. Far be it from me to tolerate such an expression. No. What is our duty? What is and what should be our mission? Educate them. Enlighten them."

I trust, therefore, I have disposed, once and for all, first, of the allegation that Mr. Redmond's national ideas are not as strong and pronounced as were those of Parnell. He has frequently declared that Parnell's motto—"No man has a right to set a limit to the march of a nation"—is his motto as well. What is more, he has acted up to the declaration.

Even in his speech on the opening day of the present session of Parliament, he declared in the House of Commons: "We did not come here for the purpose of obtaining reforms in Irish government. We came here to obtain the freedom of our country. And, Mr. Speaker, we are to-day of the same opinion that we always were, that the Irish question can never be satisfactorily or finally settled except by the concession to Ireland of a Parliament and an executive responsible to it."

I trust, therefore, that I have shown that, first, John Redmond's opinions are as soundly national as those of any of his critics; secondly, that not for five years after the speech which they now criticize was made did they find any fault with it; thirdly, that they fawned on Mr. Redmond during that interval and tried to make it appear they were his ardent supporters, and then I ask what is the influence that made them change?

More than that, I sat in the Dublin convention of June, 1900, the first united convention held under Mr. Redmond's presidency as chairman, and listened to the reading by Mr. Timothy Harrington of a cablegram sent from Boston expressing heartfelt gratitude that the Irish difficulty which had existed for ten years was at an end between the Irish representatives. The message read: "Reunited Nationalist Irishmen, Boston, send cordial greetings to reunited Irishmen at home." And among the names of the signers were P. J. Flatley, T. B. Fitzpatrick, our present respected national treasurer; John J. Teevens, Dr. P. J. Timmins, Thomas J. Collins and others. Among these names are those of two of the men who have since been the strongest adherents of Mr. Devoy's policy of criticism, and the two men to whom I refer, when they had received their orders from Mr. Devoy, within two months from that date were engaged in New England in expelling from their organization men who took the same view that they did in the cablegram they sent to Dublin.

What Caused the Change of Front?

Where is the consistency? What caused the change? What is the influence responsible for it? Mr. O'Neil Ryan in his speech in New York says that some time in 1900, or thereabouts, the Clan-Na-Gael in this country refused any longer to make itself the ally and supporter of the constitutional movement led by John Redmond. Yes, it was some time in 1900, and you, Mr. Chairman, will recall the time when here in a city close by you the word was sent forth to turn upon Mr. Redmond and upon the Irish party which had then become reunited, where for four years previously they had fawned upon and patted him on the back.

When Ireland got united after ten years of stress and struggle, that was the moment selected to divide the Irish people in America once more. And so true is this, that when the first branch of the United Irish League of America was established in Boston two months later, many honest men from the ranks of the Clan-Na-Gael attended the first meeting to establish it at the Parker House in Boston, in ignorance up to that time that it had been determined by the bosses that they should act against it. In last week's issue of the Gaelic American it is stated that it was not until Mr. Finerty had been elected head of the United Irish League in America and had attacked the Clan-Na-Gael that the Clan-Na-Gael attacked Mr. Redmond and endeavored to array the Irish people of this country against him. That, too, is false. Because when Mr. Redmond, P. A. McHugh, who had only just been released from six months' imprisonment, and Mr. Thomas O'Donnell spoke in Boston November 12, 1901, the Clan-Na-Gael posted their sentries at the doors of the Mechanics Building to prevent from attending anybody whom they could influence. And on the very morning that the delegates arrived in the city they were assailed in the public press

by the gentlemen who now say that not until they were attacked did they retaliate. And it was not until the close of the tour of Messrs. Redmond, O'Donnell and McHugh six weeks later, that on December 19, 1901, the United Irish League of America was established in America as an organization, or that Mr. Finerty was put at its head.

Their Absurd Statements Out of Joint with the Facts.

So here again their absurd statements are entirely out of joint with the facts, and show that they have to resort to falsehood to bolster up their position. When next Judge O'Neil Ryan and Mr. John Devoy undertake to explain their shuffling on this question, let them explain how and why this came about.

These gentlemen do not now believe, or profess not to believe, that a Parliamentary movement can accomplish anything worth while for Ireland. But they were not always of that opinion. Let us see how Mr. Devoy once felt himself on this point. In a letter to the Dublin Freeman on the occasion of a former "departure" of his on the Irish question, he used this language:

John Devoy's Defense of the Irish Land League Then Is Now His Own Condemnation.

"The cause of independence is not served, no cause is served, by a policy of inaction. If men who subscribe to the doctrine of independence are given nothing to do, if they are only required to be ready for an emergency which is to come at some future day they will waste their time uselessly, for while they are waiting the rest of the world is moving, and they will not have the people with them when they want them. They must recognize that there is work for to-day and to-morrow, as well as for the student of the future.

"Self-reliance is a very necessary quality in a people desirous of winning their freedom; but a disarmed people can have little of it, and Ireland cannot afford to disregard the opinion of Continental powers whose interests clash with those of England. Notwithstanding the innocent confession of gross ignorance made by one of the clever people who want us to stick to the time-honored rat-hole policy (these are Mr. Devoy's words, not mine) foreign powers do judge of us by the number of our votes and the eloquence of our representatives; that is, when they see no armed force whose power has been tested in the field on which to base their calculations, and it is not very likely that the lees of the national movement can provide the latter, and as there is no other means of enlightenment it might be well for those self-sufficient individuals to learn a little of the rudiments of politics before undertaking to give lessons to men who have long ago passed that stage."

So there was a time when Mr. Devoy did think that the Irish people would be aided by the number of their votes and the eloquence of their representatives, even in the British Parliament, whatever has caused him since to alter his views. More than that, it was he, who, at the Chicago convention of 1886, proposed the resolutions declaring in favor of Parnell's policy, even after the defeat of the first Home Rule bill, and when he knew what its provisions were. At that time he indorsed these views himself and proposed them for the indorsement of the convention, with only one dissenting voice, and that the voice of the present head of the United Irish League in America—John F. Finerty. The convention declared its "firm belief in the principles of human freedom, and the right of a people to frame their own laws, a right which lies at the foundation of the prosperity and greatness of this republic, and which has been advantageously extended to the colonial possessions of Great Britain."

They there declared themselves in favor of the system of government to-day existing in Canada, and since that time established in Australia, and after expressing their unqualified approval of the course pursued by Parnell and his party in the House of Commons, and expressing their confidence in their wisdom and ability to achieve Home Rule for Ireland, after thanking Gladstone for his efforts on behalf of Irish self-government, they cabled Parnell the following message: "Delegates of the Irish national convention of America send greeting from our body, which embraces representatives from every State and Territory in the Union, and also from Canada, and assure you of a cordial indorsement of your policy by a united and harmonious convention."

So that Mr. Devoy was not always, even on his own estimate of himself, the fierce and uncompromising warrior he declares himself to-day. He was willing to compromise in the interest of present progress, and trust to the future to make the result complete, just as John Redmond and the members of the United Irish League are to-day.

O'Neil Ryan Frankly Admits that the Clan na Gael "has not the Vaguest Idea of Precipitating an Insurrection in Ireland!"

I have quoted for you, therefore, John Redmond's declarations of principle as an Irish Nationalist, and what the methods are which he believes in pursuing to win Irish national freedom. They are, first of all, a united, independent Irish party in Westminster, declining to accept office or emolument from the English government, and a powerful and organized Irish race in America and throughout the world to back up that party, unless and until more determined and forcible methods are shown to be practical. That is a policy which is at least capable of being understood, and which men can either approve or oppose, as they see fit. But they must do it in the open. They cannot do it by stealth, and now that they have started to get into the open it is time to call a halt to the shooting from ambush which they have pursued at least for five years back.

Now, what is it that they propose as an alternative? Here it is as declared by their chosen spokesman, Judge O'Neil Ryan, in his address in New York on March 4 last. He says: "Now what—and then I will close—what is the duty, and what are the opportunities of our race here in this country? As I ventured to point out in another part of

my argument, the Irish, the party here, the Clan-Na-Gael, the men who represent what is called the physical force movement, do not mean to precipitate—and I want to make this as clear to you as language will permit—do not mean to precipitate, have not the vaguest idea of any such folly—an insurrection in Ireland. No men know better than the men who have the right to speak, and for whom I am authorized to speak here to-night, by virtue of being presented as their spokesman on this platform—no men in America or Ireland know better than they the absolute inutility, the futility, the worse than futility, the madness of provoking the Irish people, in the conditions that now exist in Ireland, to anything that smacks of insurrection.

"We know, the Irishmen of this country know," he says, "that to do so would be a crime against the Irish cause, against the Irish people, against the confidence which they place in the Clan-Na-Gael organization, if it contemplated or countenanced anything of that kind.

"I will tell you what we can do," he continues; "I will tell you wherein lies the power of the Irish race in this country, that the Clan-Na-Gael is undertaking to exert, and which it demonstrated but a year ago in Washington, when, through its efforts—I speak advisedly—and through its efforts alone, the Anglo-American arbitration treaty was defeated in the United States Senate. (Applause and cries of approval.) That was the work of the Clan-Na-Gael. There was a man on this platform to-night—I have looked around to find if he is still here, but he has probably, with that modesty that is truly Irish, gone off into some corner—I saw that man myself in Washington a year ago, and I know you will accept my word for it (Voices, 'We will, sir')—I know that man, one of your own townsmen, put the machinery in motion that, more than anything else, defeated the Anglo-American treaty."

I do not think in the presence of some of the men on this platform it is necessary to indicate who the modest man was who left the platform in New York. I do not suggest that, to use his own phrase, he went back to his "rat-hole," but I do say, and shall prove, that he did not set the machinery in motion which prevented the arbitration treaty being passed in Washington. And I shall prove it up to the hilt.

Before I start to do so I ask you what you think of the alternative policy, of the "extreme" Irish Nationalists of the United States, who start out to threaten England by declaring, as they do of their own volition, that it would be "absolute inutility, futility, worse than futility, madness, to provoke the Irish people into insurrection." That "it would be a crime against the people of Ireland."

These Vociferous "Fighting Men" Profess Their Agreement with John Redmond when it comes to the Point!

That is what John Redmond has declared, and that is what he has been denounced by these same men for declaring. Yet they express their absolute agreement with him when it comes to the point. And what is the alternative, if you please? Simply to elect O'Neil Ryan senator from Missouri, and make the election of Irishmen to the United States Senate the platform of the Irish in America for the future. American politics is henceforth to be the salvation of Ireland, and if you want to strike England on Irish soil, the best way to do it is to elect Irish-American politicians to the Senate of the United States. Unless all sense of humor has left the Irish race, the men who formulate such a policy for public approval as an alternative to the programme of the Irish people ought to be laughed out of existence within six months.

But to come back to the defeat of the treaty by the Clan-Na-Gael, as claimed by O'Neil Ryan. I shall show that the claim is as soundly based as the others to which I have already referred. What are the facts? I take as authority their own paper, The New York Gaelic American, of February 18, 1905. In it they publish a number of letters from senators whom they had asked to oppose the arbitration treaty.

In this connection I ask you to bear particularly in mind the dates, as they are of the utmost importance. In their paper of that date they publish letters from Senators Platt and Depew of New York, Lodge of Massachusetts, Gorman of Maryland, Fairbanks of Indiana and two or three others, each acknowledging the receipt of their resolutions, passed on January 11, 1905, in New York City.

The United Irish League Defeated the proposed Anglo-American Alliance.

If credit is to be given to any Irish organization for setting the United States Senate in motion against the treaty, I want to claim it for the United Irish League and prove that claim. I hold in my hand printed copies of resolutions passed by the Boston Central Branch of the United Irish League on December 22, 1904, or three weeks before the Clan-Na-Gael moved at all in the matter. And if the statement is challenged, here are the letters, dated January 5, 6 and 7, 1905, or one week before even on their own claim the Clan-Na-Gael moved in the matter at all, from several of the United States senators, acknowledging the resolutions of protest of the United Irish League of Boston against the treaty.

They are the letters of Senators Allison, Burnham, Lodge, McCreary, Burrows, Warren, Laurin, Thompson, Quarles, Cullom, Fairbanks, Fry, Perkins, Kean, Crane, Spooner and Dryden. The very latest of them is dated January 9, 1905, or two days before the Clan-Na-Gael took any action whatsoever in the matter. I want to say further that on December 15, 1904, only three days after the treaty was first submitted by Secretary Hay and the British Minister, the United Irish League had taken action in the matter, and sought the text of the treaty through one of the Massachusetts congressmen, several days before it was accessible to the public at all, and very nearly four weeks before the Clan-Na-Gael on its own published statement started to interest the senators in the question.

Their letters of acknowledgement from the senators, you will remember, show that their resolutions were passed on January 11. Let me read for you por-

tions of a letter which I sent out on behalf of the United Irish League in Boston, addressed to the representatives of various organizations, including the Clan-Na-Gael, on January 7, sixteen days after the United Irish League had itself acted, as I say by resolution, in the matter, and when the Clan-Na-Gael had not taken a single step in the interval. I read you portion of the following letter as an example:

"United Irish League,
"Boston, January 7, 1905.

"To Mr. John J. Teevens, South Boston.

"Dear Sir.—As you doubtless yourself feel, the pendency before the United States Senate of the proposed treaty between the United States and England, makes it of vital importance that every influence which people of Irish blood in America can possibly bring to bear against the ratification of such a treaty should be exercised, and as speedily as possible.

"A number of gentlemen who hold this view of the matter are of the opinion that a public meeting to express the sentiment of the opponents of the treaty should be held speedily in Faneuil hall. They realize, however, that for individuals or organizations who may not be in active sympathy with the work of the United Irish League, there may be some delicacy in participating in a meeting called directly under the auspices of that organization.

"The United Irish League does not desire any special credit in the matter beyond doing what is possible to thwart England's plans in this as in other directions. If, therefore, you and your friends either in organizations or outside of them, would feel disposed to unite with those interested in United Irish League matters in arranging such a public meeting, it ought to be possible to make an effective protest which would at least rivet public attention on the danger of the treaty passing the Senate.

"Will you be kind enough to let me know as soon as possible, if convenient by return mail, whether you would be willing to attend a private preliminary conference for that purpose, and if so, if there are any other friends you would care to have invited, and what would be a convenient time. I should be glad to do whatever lies in my power to bring about such a meeting.

"I shall be glad to place this office at the disposal of any gentlemen who desire to meet for that purpose, or if there should be any difficulty in that direction, to have some neutral ground chosen in a hall, or at a hotel, where matters could be freely discussed in this connection. Surely, if there is any one thing on which all organizations of Irishmen in America should unite, and in fact regarding which every element of strength of our race on this side of the Atlantic can be combined, it is on such a matter as this.

"The moral effect alone which a united protest against this treaty by all organizations, no matter how they may differ on other matters or on details regarding Irish affairs, could only be productive of good. Nobody participating in such a united gathering need for a moment abandon or modify any views he may hold on other matters while participating in this most important work.

"Should the suggestion commend itself to you and your friends, the question as to the selection of speakers and the text of any resolutions to be adopted, or any other details which may arise could be easily arranged at such a conference as I suggest.

"I trust you will consider the proposal on its merits, and sympathetically, for the future welfare of the Irish cause and the duty we all owe the cradle land of our race ought to dictate on such an occasion the subordination of all personal or sectional differences in the interest of a combined opposition to the oppressor of our people.

"Hoping to hear from you at your earliest convenience, I am, dear sir,

"Very truly yours,
(Signed.) "JOHN O'CALLAGHAN,
"Secretary."

That letter was sent to the representatives of various Irish organizations in Boston, including the Clan-Na-Gael by special delivery letter on January 7, 1905, and the Clan-Na-Gael's own organ clearly shows that the Clan-Na-Gael did not move in influencing the United States Senate till January 11, or four days later. You can judge for yourselves what organization it was—"speaking advisedly," as Judge O'Neil Ryan would say—that set the United States Senate in motion against the treaty.

Let me add one word further. The Clan-Na-Gael representatives who first agreed to the suggestion made in this letter, and promised to assist in carrying out the joint meeting of protest against the treaty in Faneuil Hall, before the date for which the meeting was called, January 18, 1905, were speaking in opposition to the meeting, and even went the length of threatening to write to the newspapers to declare that the Clan-Na-Gael was taking no part in the protest. They demonstrated that fact later by remaining absent from the meeting when it was held, and the reason they did so was because in the interval they had received their instructions from the "modest man" in New York, who now claims credit for defeating the treaty. I invite Judge O'Neil Ryan, when he next speaks on this topic, to give a little attention to the dates and the facts I have set forth.

Now so much for that matter. "Spokesman" O'Neil Ryan has a grievance also against Mr. Redmond because, having as Mr. Ryan says, in his control the fate of the Liberal party he did not throw the influence of the Irish vote in England for the Tories at the late election, but helped the Liberals back to power with a large majority. O'Neil Ryan may be all right as a judge, but as a statesman and an Irish leader, I doubt if the Irish people will consider him in the same class as John Redmond.

O'Neil Ryan's Idea is that Redmond should have supported Balfour and Chamberlain.

O'Neil Ryan's idea is that Mr. Redmond should have helped Mr. Balfour, Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Wyndham, for all of whom he seems, for some reason or other, to entertain very kindly feelings, back to power again at the late election, when as everyone knows the first item on their program was that the Irish representation was to be lopped off

of one-fourth of its voting power, and that the Tories had boldly and absolutely declared that they would not ask or propose a measure of Home Rule for Ireland.

Mr. Redmond, on the other hand, supported a party which has twice lost office in the effort to give Ireland Home Rule, and a Prime Minister who both before and since his election has declared, as has his chief secretary for Ireland, that they recant nothing of their former professions on this question, and who, in the very first division of the present Parliament, carried a majority of 318 into the lobby in support of the principle of self-government for Ireland.

Strangely enough, Mr. Redmond in that same debate answered this point in advance of its being made by Judge O'Neil Ryan. He said:--

"I have been blamed, and my colleagues have been blamed, by some of our friends in Ireland and outside of Ireland, because we made no bargain with the prime minister before the elections. There was no bargain. There would be no bargain on our part except on the basis of the immediate concession as the first measure of this parliament of a full measure of home rule for Ireland.

"There would be no bargain except on the basis of an alliance between our party and the liberal party which would mean in fact a merging of forces with those of the prime minister. I think we have always held the view that a position of independence for the Irish party is better for the liberal party and better for the Irish party. Hence it is that no bargain was entered into or sought by the prime minister or us."

So that, Mr. Redmond, notwithstanding all the criticism, is more jealous of the independence of the Irish party as against either English party than Mr. O'Neill Ryan and his fighting braves of the Clan-Na-Gael.

As between the political wisdom as a leader of Mr. John Redmond, therefore, and the unanimous Irish party, and the long range advice of Judge O'Neil Ryan, I think the Irish people have left little doubt which they prefer to follow. We have no objection to Judge Ryan setting his attention on the United States Senate and trying to get there if he can, but in the meantime he would be just as well advised if he allowed the Irish people to select their own leaders, to adopt their own platform, and to run their movement free from his puny and petty criticisms.

Now for the third point with which I said I would deal, the question of the sale of Mr. Redmond's estate to his tenants. I realize that it is a subject so trifling in itself that I ought not to worry this meeting by even referring to it. But it has for two years been made the stock in trade of the men in America whose one platform is to assail Mr. Redmond on any pretext whatever. Therefore I shall deal with it briefly just this one time, and I assure you that I shall decline to do so under any provocation whatsoever a second time.

Mr. Redmond himself has ignored it from the start as a paltry and trifling untruth which it was not worth his while to answer. The people of Ireland knew the facts, and that was sufficient for him. I gave the figures and the facts from authority more than a year ago in the Irish World, in response to a similar assault, but even as late as last week the Clan-Na-Gael organ has returned to the attack and quoted the falsehoods which it was supposed had been buried a year ago. They fall back on a declaration of Jasper Tully, who was kicked out of the Irish representation at the last election for double-dealing and treachery, as their ally in the falsehood.

Briefly put, the charge is that Mr. Redmond received from his tenants twenty-four and a half years purchase for the sale of property left him on the death of his uncle two or three years ago, while other landlords were receiving smaller sums.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, just like the other points which I have mentioned, the statement is absolutely false. I hold in my hand an official statement, not from Mr. Redmond himself, but from the Landed Estates Commissioners in Dublin, to whom I wrote more than a year ago for the facts in connection with the sale, when similar falsehoods to those now being repeated by Judge O'Neil Ryan and the Clan-Na-Gael organ were being circulated in this country, and I shall read for you the communication sent me by Mr. C. H. S. Jamieson, an official of that body.

Irish Land Commission. Estates' Commissioners' Office.

"Dublin, January 10, 1905.

"Dear Sir.—In reply to your inquiry as to the figures of purchase of the holdings on the estate of Mr. John Redmond, M. P., sold under the Irish Land Act, 1903, I am directed by Mr. Commissioner Bailey to send you the particulars, which are as follows:

Nature of Case.	Whether Zones Apply.	No. of Cases.	Years' Purchase.	Reduction from Rental.
Judicial rents fixed since the passing of the Act of 1903.	Within zones.....	29	23.7	22½%
	Not within zones...	2	20.7	35 %
Judicial rents fixed before the 14th of August, 1896.	Within zones.....	16	22.2	27½%
	Not within zones...	1	24.8	20 %
Non-judicial rents.....		46	18.3	40 %
Total		94	21.3	
Average reduction (substantially).....				30 %

Yours faithfully,

(Signed.) C. H. S. JAMIESON.

To J. O'Callaghan, Esq., Boston, U. S. A.

That is, in 29 cases in which judicial rents had been fixed by the land courts since the passing of the act of 1903, the tenants bought at 23.7 years' purchase, a reduction of 22½ per cent; 2 bought at 20.7 years' purchase, a reduction of 35 per cent; 16 bought at 22.2 years' purchase, a reduction of 27½ per cent. on their previous rentals; 46 bought at 18.3 years' purchase, and one at 24.8 years' purchase.

So that of the entire 94 tenants who purchased the average number of years purchase was 21.3 and more than half the number paid only 18.3 years' purchase. One-half received 40 per cent reduction on their previous rentals, which were already 25 per cent below the valuation for all the tenants, and the average all round reduction of the entire 94 tenants was 30 per cent.

In the only case in which the purchase price was twenty-four years the holding included a store or shop in addition to the farm holding, and this of course considerably enhanced its value.

As given there officially, and I challenge contradiction from any source, of the figures, the average number of years' purchase was 21.3 years, and I find in a reply of Chief Secretary Bryce's to Mr. Lawrence Ginnell, M. P., for South Westmeath, in the House of Commons on March 9 last, that he states that the average number of years' purchase paid for estates under the land act of 1903 up to the first day of February, this year, was 22.9 years' purchase, so that Mr. Redmond's estate was sold at 1.6 years' purchase less than the average all round purchase price of the land of Ireland in that interval, and three and a half years' lower than the liars (and I repeat the expression advisedly) in America have been endeavoring to convince the public was the case.

There is the additional fact, and I take the facts from the Dublin Irish People, the paper of Mr. William O'Brien, of November 9, 1903, immediately after the sale, that the rental of the property was 25 per cent. below the assessed value; that 46 of the tenants, or just one-half, received a reduction of 8 shillings in the pound, or 40 per cent., being less than 18½ years' purchase; and that Mr. Redmond wiped out absolutely and completely two years' arrears of rent, amounting to £4,000, or $20,000, already due by the tenants on the estate.

That means substantially that 19 years' purchase, instead of 24½ years, was the figure at which the estate was sold, and Mr. O'Brien's paper commented on the figures in these terms, which I commend to Judge O'Neil Ryan if he is a man of judicial temperament, and to those readers of the Gaelic American who may be disposed to admit facts when they read them.

The "Irish People" on the day mentioned said: "The publication of the facts as to the sale of Mr. Redmond's estate ought to cover with shame the unscrupulous men on both sides who have been for the last two weeks endeavoring to utilize that sale to the prejudice of the Irish leader and of the people's cause. After reading the plain statement of the facts it is hard to imagine even the most flagitious landlord or the most determined faction fighter suggesting any more that there is anything in the transaction discreditable to Mr. Redmond, or hurtful to the cause of the general body of the Irish tenants.

"In the first place Mr. Redmond's personal interest in the estate, which is loaded with family charges, is so slight that the vilest malice will scarcely suggest any selfish interest on his part in pressing unfair terms on the tenants. But it turns out that the terms themselves do not in the least degree justify the scandalous complexion placed upon them by knavish landlords and by persons who ought to have known better."

After quoting the terms which I have given you, the article continues: "It is to be hoped that for common shame's sake even the lowest type of rackrenter will henceforth forbear from quoting the case of Mr. Redmond's estate as a justification for offering terms which it would be an insult and a lie to mention in the same breath with those in the most friendly manner agreed upon between Mr. Redmond and his tenantry in prosperous Wexford."

There are the facts in reference to the sale of the Redmond estate, with this addition, that it was the tenantry themselves set the price for their lands, and asked Mr. Redmond if he would accept it; that he not alone expressed his willingness to do as they asked, but even reduced the terms they themselves set, and that they, who ought to know their own business in the matter better than even Judge O'Neil Ryan or John Devoy, passed a vote of thanks to Mr. Redmond for his generosity to them in the matter.

I trust, ladies and gentlemen, if any shame still exists among the unscrupulous assailants of Mr. Redmond in this country, they will have the grace to desist, if they do not apologize, for the falsehoods they have been circulating in regard to the matter.

I have been taken to task by the Clan-Na-Gael organ already for having described the statement of Judge O'Neil Ryan that Mr. Redmond had set the pace for the Irish landlords by raising the price of his own land on his tenants, as a lie. It is the most direct and accurate description I could give of his assertion. I am here to-night again, having given the facts which I have quoted to you, which are authentic, from under the hand of the authorized official of the Land Commission itself, and having done so, I repeat again that, notwithstanding his judicial position, the statement made by Judge O'Neil Ryan is a lie.

I know, of course, that I shall be described again in the Gaelic American as I have been within a few weeks past, as the press agent of Mr. Redmond in America, in resenting these slanders. As to that, I will only suggest that it is a pleasure, as well as a duty to me, to point out wherein Mr. Redmond has been and is being misrepresented by men who ought to be his friends, and if to do so means to be his press agent, I can only add that in being so, I have not, like the man who used the expression, Mr. John Devoy, lived for twenty-five years as a parasite on the Irish movement in America, but have been content to pursue my own humble way, and earn my

own humble living. And I need not add, what your chairman here to-night knows personally, that the one condition on which I consented to act officially in connection with the United Irish League of America on the day of its foundation, and down to now, was that there should not be a cent of salary attached to the office which I fill. When Mr. Devoy talks of press agents he had better talk to somebody who does not know as well as I do the role that he has been filling for so long.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, these matters may have seemed, and undoubtedly are perhaps in themselves, trifling, but they have formed the basis of all the opposition which it has been sought to offer to Mr. Redmond and the Irish party in the last three or four years. If there is any other policy or any other ground for opposition to the national movement being conducted by the Irish people today, now is the time for men to openly declare it, and let the public judge as between their policy and ours.

We at all events stand now where we have always stood. We say that the policy adopted by the Irish people in their movement, and the men whom they select to conduct that policy, are good enough for us, and we will give them every support in our power. Irishmen for seven hundred years have resented and resisted the attempt of England to rule them, although she is only sixty miles distant from the Irish shore. If sixty miles of Irish sea was sufficient to make that rule foreign, it is far more foreign if a policy is dictated from a distance of three thousand miles by men who do not go to share the dangers which their policy calls for.

The Danger of the "Physical Force Policy" now is the Fear of not Getting into the U. S. Senate.

But I have forgotten. The only danger now called for in pursuing the new policy is the danger of not getting elected to the United States Senate. That is the modern extreme definition of the program of Emmet and Wolfe Tone.

Ireland by every test which can be applied or could be applied has declared her confidence in her present leaders and in the Irish party. Not a man has dared in an Irish constituency to challenge that policy at the polls. Not a man dares to challenge it in an Irish County Council or in an Irish city government. And if the people of the country, with one voice, speak out in favor of that policy and those leaders, then I care not who the man be or what his own estimate of himself in America who attempts to oppose or thwart the will of the Irish people plainly expressed, I say he is a marplot, an obstructionist, and a destroyer, if he be not worse.

I do not for a moment suggest, nor do I believe, that the hundreds of honest men who, silently, in the interest of peace in the Clan-Na-Gael ranks, permit this policy of destruction to go on, have any sympathy with it. I know the contrary is the fact, and have been told by many of them that they are heart-sore and discouraged that it should have continued so long.

To these men we appeal, and ask them to consider if they are doing their duty as Irishmen in this crisis by remaining quiescent when so much is at stake for the nation from which we all have sprung. We have lived, many of us to middle age, hearing all the time that some day or other in the near future there was going to be a fight for Ireland on Irish soil. Then we were told it would be in the far east or somewhere else throughout the world; that English arms were to be thrown down in defeat by Irishmen. The chance came a few years ago in South Africa, and how was it availed of by these bold, and outspoken warriors, who fight only with their mouths and with their pens at three thousand miles' range?

They allowed the liberty of the South African republics to be strangled before their eyes, and did not have the courage to risk a man nor destroy a mule, with a British camp under their noses down in New Orleans, and the Governor of the State of Louisiana publicly inviting them to break it up. More than that, anybody who suggested to them that any measures of that kind should be taken was branded, as far as they could do so, as a man to be regarded with suspicion, because they did not have the courage to do themselves, or allow others to do, what they had so long been professing themselves anxious to attempt.

They Reserved Their Mud Batteries for the Representatives of Ireland.

They reserved their mud batteries for the representatives of Ireland, fighting as best they could in a hostile English Senate for the brave people of the South African republic. The result of the Russian-Japanese war, together with the result of the Boer War, has—however we may regret that result—put an end for the time being at least to the old and shopworn declaration to which we have been so long accustomed, that "England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity." And the very latest program, apparently, is that the energies of the Irish people, instead of being devoted to attempting to raise the lot of their own oppressed and downtrodden nation in Ireland, are to be turned to the Indian frontier and to be directed to freeing the people of India, while Ireland is left to win her freedom by electing United States Senators to Washington. We are told that if the fight cannot be won by forcible means in this generation that it must be handed down to our children and our grandchildren.

That was not the policy of the brave United Irishmen, of the Young Irelanders, nor of the men of the Fenian movement. They strove to act, and in their own time; and there is not a member of the United Irish League who does not believe to the fullest extent in their principles if they can be made practicable to-day.

Some of us prefer to take whatever hand we can in the fight ourselves, and leave what we cannot attend to to be taken care of by our children and our grandchildren. And I hope I may without impropriety suggest that if the settlement of this struggle is to be bequeathed to our grandchildren, the sooner some of the would-be leaders and critics of the Irish parliamentary party and of Mr. John Redmond make prepa-

rations for that possibility, by going and getting married, the greater the probability that the fight may be even then successfully concluded.

We of the United Irish League prefer to hold up the hands and sustain the men whom Ireland chooses as her leaders while they are yet alive and in the flesh, able to do something for the cause in which we all believe. We do not want to wait until they are dead and their ashes rest in Glasnevin, and then make pilgrimages to their graves or speak soft words of them when they are gone, while we had nothing but abuse and misrepresentation for them while they lived. We appeal to the public spirit and the courage of the plain people of our race in America to speak out boldly and make it plain that they will not tolerate these dark-lantern methods of stabbing in the back the leaders chosen by the Irish people. They should insist on having fair play accorded to the men who have borne the heat and the stress of the day, have faced the plank bed and the prison cell in the cause of Ireland, and who, if their methods may not for the moment be as extreme as those of other generations, have at least demonstrated that they can be under the circumstances more effective.

We adopt to the fullest extent the declaration that "No man has a right to set a limit to the march of a nation," but we also declare that no man has a right to thwart the effort of a nation while claiming to be the only advocate and supporter of the people of that nation. These men cannot blow hot and cold at the same time. They cannot run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. Let them stand openly and boldly with England as enemies of the Irish party and the Irish cause, or if they cannot do so, let them stand aside, follow their own lines, and cease abuse of the men who are striving as best they can to right the wrongs of their country.

"Strutting about in the Borrowed Plumes of the Men of '67."

If they have a swifter or sterner method, there is nobody preventing them from using it. They have been wished God speed many a time and oft if they desired to do anything to right the wrongs of Ireland; but the mere strutting around in the borrowed plumes of the men of '67, '48 and '98, and insisting that their own estimate of themselves must be taken, while they neither accomplish anything themselves nor will allow anybody else to attempt it, is alike ridiculous and absurd. Their place is either in the ranks of the Irish movement, as conducted by the Irish people, or outside it as open foes instead of professed friends. At any rate, if they cannot see their way to help the movement they ought for very shame sake cease affording gratification to the enemies of the Irish cause by preventing and obstructing as far as they can the efforts of the honest men who have done so much for Ireland.

Mr. Devoy, as far back as 1882, when the Land League agitation of which the United Irish League is the continuation had only won one measure of reform, the land act of 1881, spoke in these terms:

"The land league accomplished much for Ireland. It had aroused the whole Irish race the world over to the necessity of standing by their native land, and it had organized them. It had concentrated their attention on Ireland, and given a great impetus to their resolve to aid their countrymen at home to shake off the English yoke.

"It had raised the Irish question to the position of a European one, and tied England's hands in her dealings with other powers to a degree that had never been witnessed before. It was a revolt which was not an armed revolution, but which necessitated the continuous presence of the only military force which England had available for foreign war. It helped materially to break down the prejudices of the northern Protestants, and prepared the way for their political amalgamation with the rest of the people. It utterly broke down the political power and influence of the landlords which was always the chief support of English rule, and entirely removed the slavish servility and timidity of the agricultural classes, which had been until then a barrier to all independence of political action. In short, under its influence, a democracy was organized which won the allegiance of the majority of the Irish people and commenced to sway the destinies of the country.

"It destroyed the old political forces which had dominated the land for centuries, and put new ones into active operation which had hitherto lain dormant. It began a revolution, and prepared the way for a new Ireland, destined to play an important part in the world through its relations with the British empire and the rest of the world."

Some of the Good Results Achieved by the Land League and United Irish League.

Is the winning of the land act of 1881 alone justified this praise of agitation by Mr. Devoy, how much more worthy is the movement which has since won, one after another, much more important social and political reforms? Since those words were written by Mr. Devoy the Irish movement secured the arrears of rent act of 1882, which wiped out $10,000,000 of arrears of rent; the Light Railway Act of 1882, giving $8,000,000 for the building of Irish railroads; in 1883 the Laborers' Act, which has resulted in the spending of nearly $20,000,000 since for the erection of healthy and sanitary laborers' cottages in Ireland; four distinct land purchase acts, in 1885, 1888, 1891 and 1903, under which nearly $400,000,000 has since been expended in the purchase of Irish land, and as much more is available for the same purpose within the next five or six years; secured the agricultural act of 1898, resulting in the advance since of upward of $6,000,000 for Irish agriculture, and, above and beyond all, the local government act of 1898, under which the local business, formerly transacted by the landlord grand juries, is to-day being transacted by the elected representatives of the Irish people.

There is an old saying that there are none so blind as those who will not see, and the men who elect to close their eyes to these immense gains can only be classed as knaves or fools.

Judge O'Neil Ryan, fearless fighter at long range that he is, has a grievance against Daniel O'Connell. He intimates that the work of this giant Irishman has

been a detriment rather than a help to Ireland. Striking that magnificent posture, which belongs to a born fighter, he declares that Daniel O'Connell "compromised the national rights of the Irish people." Just think of it! Daniel O'Connell compromising the rights of Judge O'Neil Ryan. Ye Gods!

Judge O'Neil Ryan is strong on "the traditions of his ancestors," but in his desire to trample on prostrate England he has no gratitude for the mere non-fighting leaders like Daniel O'Connell. He could have done so much better himself if he were leader.

Let me in this connection suggest something to Judge O'Neil Ryan which he probably does not know. If he is so anxious to get out and fight for Ireland it ought to be some consolation to him to know that, as a result of the work of Mr. John Redmond and the Irish party in the last five years, it will be much easier for him to plant his cannon when he gets them, on Irish soil, than it would have been if the United Irish League movement had not existed. For, if he goes to lead a friendly invasion in Ireland, as he has so long been threatening to do, he will find it much easier to make a landing there as a result of Mr. Redmond's work than he otherwise would.

He will find that as a result of the passage of the Land Act of 1903 the strength of the Irish police force has been reduced by about one-third since, and that recruiting Irish police has been stopped. So, in a quiet way, Mr. Redmond and the Irish party have been making it easier for warriors bold like Judge O'Neil Ryan to leave their footprints on Irish soil than it would otherwise have been.

I have given you a few of the fruits of the movement of the last 25 years. The last and crowning victory, that of Home Rule for Ireland itself, is practically within sight, if the hands of Ireland's representatives are sustained as they ought to be. This is not, however, a time for men to falter and grow cold in this fight. It is time, on the contrary, when we should lift up our hearts and by a combined and earnest effort of the Irish race throughout the world, ensure the last and final triumph of the struggle for which so many generations of our people have suffered and bled and died and sacrificed everything that life held dear to win.

In that spirit, whoever else may raise their hands against him, we of the United Irish League of America pledge our heartiest and most united support and every effort it is possible to make to uphold the hands of the brilliant leader of the Irish people, John Redmond, and the equally able and self-sacrificing colleagues by whom he is surrounded.

ISSUED BY

THE UNITED IRISH LEAGUE OF AMERICA

SECRETARY'S OFFICE:
ROOM 32, GLOBE BUILDING, BOSTON.

THE TRIPLE LEAGUE.

WHAT THE LAND LEAGUE THE NATIONAL LEAGUE AND THE UNITED IRISH LEAGUE HAVE GAINED FOR IRELAND.

What has Ireland gained, in financial benefits alone, as a result of the agitation of the past 26 years? In round figures more than a billion dollars. Here are the results in detail:

RESULTS OF PARLIAMENTARY AGITATION—1879-1903.

Land Act, 1881, reduced Irish rents by $10,000,000 per year, 20 years	$200,000,000
Land Purchase Acts, 1885-88 (advanced for purchase of land by tenants)	50,000,000
Land Purchase Act, 1891 (advanced for purchase of land by tenants)	150,000,000
Light Railway Act, 1882	8,000,000
Arrears of Rent Act, 1882 (wiped out completely)	10,000,000
Laborers' Act, 1883, for building laborers' cottages	15,000,000
Migration Act, 1882, transferring tenants to richer lands	5,000,000
Agricultural Act, 1898, improving agriculture	1,000,000
Annually (for same purpose since 1898), $830,000	5,080,000
Land Act, 1903, amount to be advanced (estimated)	600,000,000
Bonus under Land Act, 1903 (without repayment)	60,000,000
Total	$1,104,080,000

It is, of course, true, that a great part of this vast amount has been in the form of advances to the Irish tenants, which they either have had to pay back with interest or will have to pay later on. And it is likewise true that notwithstanding these advances, whether they took the form of gifts or loans, Ireland is still being compelled to pay in taxation, over and above what a British appointed royal commission in 1895 reported she should in justice be asked to pay, a sum of from $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 anually. But despite that fact, surely it will not be seriously contended by anybody that Ireland would have been better off if she had allowed the eleven hundred millions of dollars which she has wrung from a hostile British Parliament since 1880 to have remained in the plethoric coffers of the British Treasury.

But aside from the substantial financial gains she has won, Ireland has achieved by the movement of the last 25 years great reforms in other directions, although it is not possible to reckon on their benefits in cold cash alone. Parnell and the Irish party, in 1884, won the Franchise Act, which extended what is practically manhood suffrage for the first time to Ireland. The result was speedily seen in the return of democratic and Nationalist representatives for most of the Parliamentary seats. and the public bodies of the country. The passage in 1898 of the Local Government Act, establishing the county, district and rural councils in Ireland, swept away at one stroke the old feudal grand jury system under which the people had groaned helplessly for a couple of centuries, and gave the plain people of the country for the first time a decisive voice in the management of their own local concerns. Nobody who is not conversant with the conditions under which the people were ground down under the old grand jury system can have an adequate conception of the change for the better which has been wrought under the working of the Local Government Act of 1898. It is only men who have had no experience of Irish life under the old system who display their lack of information by attempting to maintain that its abolition has not meant a vast and far-reaching change in the social, material and national life of Ireland.

But it is contended by some people that the winning of such Parliamentary reforms as have been achieved by the Land League, the National League and United Irish League movement, and the financial results arising therefrom have had, and if continued would have a tendency to make the Irish people less national, and more tolerant of British rule than they had previously been. The contention is absurd. Probably at no period in their history have the Irish people been less friendly disposed to British rule in Ireland than they are today. It is simply ridiculous to assert the contrary. And the Irish people, because of the agitation of the last quarter of a century, possess facilities for making their hostility to England felt today, which they never possessed at any period in the past.

1914
NOV 10 A
MAY -9
J FEB 2